



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/816,967

03/23/2001

Gregory J. Mann

BUR9-2001-0025-US1

8686

29154

7590

05/15/2006

FREDERICK W. GIBB, III

GIBB INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW FIRM, LLC

2568-A RIVA ROAD

SUITE 304

ANNAPOLIS, MD 21401

EXAMINER

JOO, JOSHUA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2154

DATE MAILED: 05/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/816,967

Applicant(s)

MANN, GREGORY J.

Examiner

Joshua Joo

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/6/05.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

Response to Amendment filed 10/27/2005

1. Claims 1-21 are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aguilar et al, US Patent #6,199,137, in view of Maduzia et al, US Patent #5,488,408 (Maduzia hereinafter).

5. As per claim 1, Aguilar teaches a core for providing communications between a transmission media and a processor in a parallel-serial architecture, Aguilar's teaching comprising:

serial lanes connecting said processor to said transmission media (i.e. via port; see fig.

2); and

at least one selector (data MUX) connected to said serial lanes (see fig. 2).

Art Unit: 2154

6. However, Aguilar does not teach selector selectively engages different number of said serial lanes to alter speed of data passing through said core. Maduzia teaches the concept of selecting a number of lines of a serial communication (Col 11, lines 9-13, 44-49).

7. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill that changing the number of lines would alter the speed of communication as speed of data transmission depends on available bandwidth. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Aguilar and Maduzia because Maduzia teachings would improve the system of Aguilar by communicating using different configurations according to protocols or devices in the communication system.

8. As to claim 8, Aguilar teaches a parallel-serial system comprising:

at least one processor (item 210, fig. 2);

at least one transmission media (via ports; item 240, fig. 2) connecting said one processor (see fig. 2); and

a core between each processor and said transmission media, said core providing communication between said transmission media and said processor, and said core comprising:

serial lanes connecting said processor to said transmission media (i.e. via port; see fig. 2); and

at least one selector (data MUX) connected to said serial lanes (see fig. 2).

9. However, Aguilar does not teach selector selectively engages different number of said serial lanes to alter speed of data passing through said core. Maduzia teaches the concept of selecting a number of lines of a serial communication (Col 11, lines 9-13, 44-49).

Art Unit: 2154

10. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill that changing the number of lines would alter the speed of communication as speed of data transmission depends on available bandwidth. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Aguilar and Maduzia because Maduzia teachings would improve the system of Aguilar by communicating using different configurations according to protocols or devices in the communication system.

11. As to claim 15, Aguilar teaches a core for providing communications between a transmission media and a processor in a byte-stripped parallel-serial architecture, Aguilar's teaching comprising:

serial lanes connecting said processor to said transmission media (i.e. via port; see fig.

2); and

at least one selector (data MUX) connected to said serial lanes (see fig. 2).

12. However, Aguilar does not teach a selector selectively engages different number of said serial lanes to alter speed of data passing through said core. Maduzia teaches the concept of selecting a number of lines of a serial communication (Col 11, lines 9-13, 44-49).

13. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill that changing the number of lines would alter the speed of communication as speed of data transmission depends on available bandwidth. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Aguilar and Maduzia because Maduzia teachings would improve the system of Aguilar by communicating using different configurations according to protocols or devices in the communication system.

Art Unit: 2154

14. As per claim 2, Aguilar teaches the core further comprising a data controller (router; item 230, fig. 2) for controlling an operation of said selector.

15. As per claim 3, Aguilar teaches the core wherein each of said serial lanes include a buffer (see fig. 2).

16. As per claim 4, Aguilar teaches the core wherein said buffers comprise elastic (inherent) first-in, first-out (FIFO) buffers (see fig. 2).

17. As per claims 5, Aguilar teaches the core wherein said selector comprises a multiplexor (see item 250, fig. 2).

18. As per claims 6, Aguilar teaches the core wherein additional speed adjustments is attained by said selector engaging additional lanes (see fig. 2).

19. As per claims 7, Aguilar teaches the core wherein said transmission media operates at a different data speed than said processor (inherent; see fig. 2).

20. Claims 9-14 are similar in limitations as claims 2-7. Aguilar and Maduzia in combination teach apparatus as set forth in claims 2-7. Therefore, Aguilar and Maduzia in combination also teach apparatus as set forth in claims 9-14.

Art Unit: 2154

21. Claims 16-21 are similar in limitations as claims 2-7. Aguilar and Maduzia in combination teach apparatus as set forth in claims 2-7. Therefore, Aguilar and Maduzia also teach apparatus as set forth in claims 16-21.

Conclusion

22. A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.

23. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua Joo whose telephone number is 571 272-3966. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday 8AM to 5PM and every other Friday.

24. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee can be reached on 571 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

25. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

May 8, 2006
JJ

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100